

11 April 1952

MEMORANDUM

TO : Chairman, Career Service Committee

FROM : Chairman, Working Group on PERSONNEL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

SUBJECT : Adjustments to Career Service Program

REFERENCE: Your Memorandum of 8 April 1952, Same Subject

1. Reference directed that the Working Group on Personnel Development Program make certain changes to material it has submitted to you on the Career Service Program.

2. Tab A meets the requirements set by paragraph 3. a. of Reference and is furnished in the form of a CIA Regulation. However, for the reasons stated in paragraph 4 below, it is recommended that Tab B be accepted instead of Tab A.

3. Tab C is furnished as the recommended Personnel Evaluation Report. As directed by paragraph 3. c. of Reference, this recommended form retains the simplicity of the original but eliminates the requirement that the person evaluated see the supervisor's evaluation and comments. The Working Group considered but rejected as unduly cumbersome the proposed two-form instrument comprising a Personnel Evaluation Report not shown to the employee and a Career Development Guide that is shown him.

4. Tab B is recommended in lieu of Tab A because:

- a. Paragraph 3. a. of Reference requires a directive appointing the CIA Career Service Board "as constituted in your Tab G." This "Tab G" is in fact long since out of date, having been supplanted by Tab D of my report of 5 March to you. This up-to-date version represents the combined product of my working group and the Working Group on Rotation and was coordinated with all working groups. It is embodied in Tab B of this memorandum, but not in Tab A.
- b. Tab B (paragraph 1. A. (2) f) assigns to the CIA Career Service Board the function of reviewing personnel evaluation reports on AD's and DAD's rather than "acting as a rating board" as required by Reference. This provision of Tab B is recommended because it is felt that "rating" is strictly a line function and the supervisor, not a board, must rate the persons he supervises. On the other hand, it is felt

that if the CIA Career Service Board reviews the evaluation reports it may find much of value that will help it solve both policy and specific problems in the career program. There is the further point that the Personnel Evaluation Report is not a "rating" form as my working group understands that term since it does not compare the person rated with other persons.

- c. It is believed that the membership (of the Office Career Service Boards) as proposed in Tab B is more flexible than that proposed in paragraph 3. a. of Reference and at the same time permits the function of appropriate review of personnel evaluation reports.
- d. The justification for one member on the Office Board below the Staff or Division Chief level is not seen, was unanimously rejected and such a member is therefore not included in Tab B.
- e. Tab B does not include on the Office Board a member from another Office. There is nothing to prevent calling in an official from another Office when rotation or other problems involving two or more offices are being considered. But it is felt not worth the cost to have an extra Office member sit regularly with each Office Board. Uniformity of practice could probably be better assured by effective liaison between the Secretariat of the CIA Career Service Board with each of the Office Boards.

/s/



25X1A9A

CONFIDENTIAL

- 2 -